

Summary Notes from Third Stakeholders Meeting 11-30-10

Tuesday, November 30, 2010, 6:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. at Board of Supervisors Meeting Room, Leesburg

- 1. Welcome/Introduction of Participants & County Officials** – Facilitator opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.
- 2. Agenda Overview** – Facilitator reviewed the agenda, the basic process requirements set by the Board of Supervisors, and the upcoming schedule of meetings.
- 3. Review Results of First Two Meetings** – Facilitator reviewed the highlights of first two meetings. Stakeholders clarified the ground rules for decision making and affirmed that two-thirds support of stakeholders present would constitute consensus of the group on any given issue.
- 4 & 5. Review Issues Matrix** – Representatives continued reviewing the Issues Matrix prepared by staff based on input to date.

The Stakeholders began reviewing the re-ordered list of issues, each of which had a proposed resolution, aimed at finding broad support, based upon the previous discussions of the group. The discussion began with Issue #1 and did not move beyond that to the other issues.

Issue #1 – RPA Mapping

At the previous meeting, there was broad support for Options 5 and/or 6. Staff offered a new Option 7. *Discussion:*

RPA is defined in the regulatory framework from the State; it is worthwhile to stay within settled framework. County Attorney noted that the County has some latitude in customizing the definition.

Participants affirmed the components of the RPA, in terms of what needs to be addressed to solve the mapping issue:

- Streams
- Wetlands
- Buffer width

Streams

Participants identified three basic mapping alternatives. There was broad support for either option 2 or 3:

- 1 intermittent streams, or
- 2 perennial streams as mapped in draft amendments, or
- 3 perennial streams as mapped based on the size of drainage area, say 35 or 50 acres.

Key sub-issues:

- Balancing the desire to include all perennial streams, with the difficulty and cost of obtaining reliable data to identify such streams (staff estimates that about 2/3 of all perennial streams are shown on the current map base).
- Cost of delineation to the county; cost of delineation to the landowner.
- Balancing cost impacts on different types of landowners – homeowners, farmers, developers.
- Level of accuracy/amount of built-in error in defining perennial streams.
- Process, cost, and timing of delineations and of exemptions/waivers.
- Area of land disturbance allowed before site delineation is required.

Wetlands

Key sub-issue: Whether to include connected wetlands, or just “the green line.” How much local regulatory control is needed vis-à-vis federal and state regulatory control.

Buffer width

Participants did not reach this issue in their discussion.

Other Matters

- Participants asked staff to bring maps showing the RPA based upon the drainage area approach.
- Participant asked to address various related issues raised by the recent release of Virginia’s Chesapeake Bay TMDL Phase I Watershed Implementation Plan.
- Participants asked for communication on the activities of the BOS Transportation / Land Use Committee regarding buffer incentives.

6. Review Results of Meeting - A brief recap was discussed and reminder of continuation of the meeting to December 2.

7. Adjourn – Facilitator adjourned the meeting at 9:30 pm.

Note Schedule of remaining meetings:

Thursday, December 2 - 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. - BOS meeting room

Tuesday, December 7 - 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. - BOS meeting room

Thursday, December 9 - 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. - BOS meeting room

Tuesday, December 14 - 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. - BOS meeting room